

Appendix 1. PEDro critical review

Appendix 1. PEDro critical review of randomized controlled tri

| | Item Number | | | | | | | | | | | Score (#/10) |
|-------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|--------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | |
| Whittingham et al, 2004 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Ayar et al, 2011 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| Cowan et al, 2002 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Crossley et al, 2002 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| Clark et al, 2000 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| Mason et al, 2011 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Akbas et al, 2011 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 |

1, criterion achieved; 0, criterion not achieved

Key: The numbers refer to the questions below.

1. Eligibility criteria were specified (does not count toward score)
2. Subjects were randomly allocated to groups
3. Allocation was concealed
4. The groups were similar at baseline
5. There was blinding of all subjects
6. There was blinding of all therapists
7. There was blinding of all assessors
8. Adequate follow-up of at least 85%
9. Intention to treat analysis
10. Between group comparisons reported
11. Point estimates and variability of outcomes provided